



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,700	02/13/2002	Stephen J. Mattingly	97012/07CIP	8082

23873 7590 05/09/2005
ROBERT W STROZIER, P.L.L.C
PO BOX 429
BELLAIRE, TX 77402-0429

EXAMINER

TATE, CHRISTOPHER ROBIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1654

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/074,700

Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher R. Tate

Art Unit

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 35,36,38-42,44-50 and 60-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35, 36, 38-42, 44-50, and 60-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application and has been entered.

Claims 35, 36, 38-42, 44-50, and 60-68 are presented for examination on the merits.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

With respect to the biological deposit requirement set forth in the previous Office action, claims 35, 36, 38-42, 44-50, and 60-68 stand/are rejected under U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for the reasons set forth therein.

Applicants' state that they will submit a viable culture to a depository if allowable subject matter matures from this application. Accordingly, the above rejection stands.

It is also noted that Applicants made arguments against a USC, 112, first paragraph scope of enablement rejection. However, a scope of enablement rejection was not made in the previous Office action over the claims (as previously amended). [Further, it is not understood by the Examiner as to why Applicants state at the beginning of their March 21, 2005 response that the remarks therein are a complete response to the Examiner's 12 August 2003 Non-Final Office action - i.e., although a Non-Final Office action was mailed 12 August 2003, the last Office action of record was 20 October 2004, and the Office action prior to that 11 March 2004.]

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 35, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 48, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jong et al. (KR 9411524 - DWPI Abstract), with evidence provided by the ATCC Catalogue of Bacteria and Bacteriophages (18th ed., 1992) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action which are restated below (as they apply to the previously amended claims).

Jong et al. teach a composition comprising *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus* (which, as evidenced by the ATCC Catalogue, is now well known and recognized in the art as *Rhodobacter capsulatus* - i.e., *Rhodobacter capsulatus* was earlier known as *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*; however, *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus* has since been renamed *Rhodobacter capsulatus* - see, e.g., pages 269 and 275 under the respective genus/species headings *Rhodobacter capsulatus* and *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*) as an active ingredient therein, whereby the composition further includes a carbohydrate and/or humus (please note that humus is dead plant material and, thus, would inherently contain cellulosic material therein since cellulosic material such as cellulose is defined as an "amorphous carbohydrate polymer (C₆H₁₀O₅), the main constituent of all plant tissues and fibers" (Webster's Dictionary, 1988) - see DWPI Abstract. Please note that nothing would preclude the additional ingredient(s) disclosed by the cited reference from being used as "insect food").

Therefore, the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

Claims 35, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 48, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi (JP 05247378 - CAPLUS Abstract), with evidence provided by the ATCC Catalogue of Bacteria and Bacteriophages (18th ed., 1992) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action which are restated below (as they apply to the previously amended claims).

Art Unit: 1654

Kobayashi teaches a composition comprising *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus* (which, as evidenced by the ATCC Catalogue, is now well known and recognized in the art as *Rhodobacter capsulatus* - i.e., *Rhodobacter capsulatus* was earlier known as *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*; however, *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus* has since been renamed *Rhodobacter capsulatus* - see, e.g., pages 269 and 275 under the respective genus/species headings *Rhodobacter capsulatus* and *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*) as an active ingredient therein, whereby the composition further includes cellulose (a carbohydrate polymer) - see CAPLUS Abstract. Please note that nothing would preclude the additional ingredient(s) disclosed by the cited reference from being used as "insect food".

Therefore, the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

Claims 35, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 48, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nippon Life KK (JP 60027672 - DWPI Abstract), with evidence provided by the ATCC Catalogue of Bacteria and Bacteriophages (18th ed., 1992) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action which are restated below (as they apply to the previously amended claims).

Nippon Life KK teaches a composition comprising *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus* (which, as evidenced by the ATCC Catalogue, is now well known and recognized in the art as *Rhodobacter capsulatus* - i.e., *Rhodobacter capsulatus* was earlier known as *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*; however, *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus* has since been renamed *Rhodobacter capsulatus* - see, e.g., pages 269 and 275 under the respective genus/species headings *Rhodobacter capsulatus* and *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*) as an active ingredient therein, whereby the composition further includes various carbohydrate-containing ingredients including

Art Unit: 1654

rice bran which would inherently comprise cellulosic material (e.g., cellulose - a carbohydrate polymer) - see DWPI Abstract. Please note that nothing would preclude the additional ingredient(s) disclosed by the cited reference from being used as "insect food".

Therefore, the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

Claims 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44-48, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuda (JP 05304959 - JPAB Abstract), with evidence provided by the ATCC Catalogue of Bacteria and Bacteriophages (18th ed., 1992) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action which are restated below (as they apply to the previously amended claims).

Matsuda teaches a composition comprising *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus* (which, as evidenced by the ATCC Catalogue, is now well known and recognized in the art as *Rhodobacter capsulatus* - i.e., *Rhodobacter capsulatus* was earlier known as *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*; however, *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus* has since been renamed *Rhodobacter capsulatus* - see, e.g., pages 269 and 275 under the respective genus/species headings *Rhodobacter capsulatus* and *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*) in an amount of 10^6 - 10^{10} /g as an active ingredient therein, whereby the composition further comprises a bacterial culture solution (which would inherently contain at least one carbohydrate therein) - see JPAB Abstract. Please note that nothing would preclude the additional ingredient(s) disclosed by the cited reference from being used as "insect food".

Therefore, the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

Art Unit: 1654

Claims 35, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 48, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (JP 09238681 - JPAB Abstract), with evidence provided by the ATCC Catalogue of Bacteria and Bacteriophages (18th ed., 1992) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action which are restated below (as they apply to the previously amended claims).

Kobayashi et al. teach a composition comprising *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus* (which, as evidenced by the ATCC Catalogue, is now well known and recognized in the art as *Rhodobacter capsulatus* - i.e., *Rhodobacter capsulatus* was earlier known as *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*; however, *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus* has since been renamed *Rhodobacter capsulatus* - see, e.g., pages 269 and 275 under the respective genus/species headings *Rhodobacter capsulatus* and *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*) as an active ingredient therein, whereby the composition further a seaweed polysaccharide (carbohydrate) - see JPAB Abstract. Please note that nothing would preclude the additional ingredient(s) disclosed by the cited reference from being used as "insect food".

Therefore, the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

Claims 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44-48, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the ATCC Catalogue of Bacteria and Bacteriophages (18th ed., 1992) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action which are restated below (as they apply to the previously amended claims).

The ATCC Catalogue teaches compositions comprising pure cultures (thus, apparently within the claimed amount ranges) of *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus* (which, as evidenced by the ATCC Catalogue, is now well known and recognized in the art as *Rhodobacter capsulatus* - i.e., *Rhodobacter capsulatus* was earlier known as *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*; however,

Art Unit: 1654

Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus has since been renamed *Rhodobacter capsulatus* - see, e.g., pages 269 and 275 under the respective genus/species headings *Rhodobacter capsulatus* and *Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*), whereby the composition further comprises a concentrated growth medium (which would inherently contain at least one carbohydrate therein) as well as double strength skim milk (which also inherently contains carbohydrates therein such as lactose) - see, e.g., pages vi, 269, 275, 542 and 543 . Please note that nothing would preclude the additional ingredient(s) disclosed by the cited reference from being used as "insect food".

Therefore, the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44-48, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jong et al. (KR 9411524 - DWPI Abstract), Kobayashi (JP 05247378 - CAPLUS Abstract), Nippon Life KK (JP 60027672 - DWPI Abstract), Matsuda (JP 05304959 - JPAB Abstract), or Kobayashi et al. (JP 09238681 - JPAB Abstract), with evidence provided by the ATCC Catalogue of Bacteria and Bacteriophages (18th ed., 1992); or over the ATCC Catalogue of Bacteria and Bacteriophages (18th ed., 1992) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action which are restated below (as they apply to the previously amended claims).

The references are relied upon for the reasons set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to prepare a composition (such as any one of those disclosed by the cited references) comprising a result-effective amount of *Rhodobacter capsulatus* (*Rhodopseudomonas capsulatus*), especially since each of the cited references beneficially teach

Art Unit: 1654

that this bacterial species is an active ingredient (and/or pure culture) therein. Accordingly, the adjustment of this particular conventional working conditions as well as other conventional working conditions (e.g., further including and/or substituting a commonly-employed, readily-available cellulosic carbohydrate source within such compositions), is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Thus, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over one or more of the cited references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Applicant's arguments concerning the above art rejections have been carefully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive of error in the rejections. In response to Applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which Applicant relies (e.g., a particular amount of carbohydrates including - e.g., at least 50 wt.%; and/or a composition including an insect food, separate from the culture medium) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In addition, Applicant continues to argue that the art references do not teach an insecticidal amount of *Rhodobacter capsulatus* bacteria and/or the use of such compositions as claimed - i.e., for controlling particular insect populations. However, it is reemphasized that the reference compositions would inherently be in amounts which would provide the claimed insecticidal effect. Further, as discussed in previous Office actions, with respect to the U.S.C. 102 and 103 rejections above, it is noted that although

Art Unit: 1654

the cited references do not teach that the compositions therein can be used in the manner instantly claimed, the intended use of the claimed composition does not patentably distinguish the composition, per se, since such undisclosed use is inherent in the reference compositions. In order to be limiting, the intended use must create a structural difference between the claimed composition and the prior art compositions. In the instant case, the intended use does not create a structural difference, thus the intended use is not limiting. Please note that when applicant claims a composition in terms of function and the composition of the prior art appears to be the same, the Examiner may make a rejection under both 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 (MPEP 2112). Applicants further argue that the cited references do not teach an insect food, as instantly disclosed. However, as discussed above, the ingredients disclosed by the cited references (including carbohydrates, etc.) would be suitable for ingestion by insects and, thus, read upon "insect food" - i.e., nothing would preclude the additional ingredient(s) disclosed by the cited references from being used as "insect food".

Claims 40, 49, and 60-68 are free of the art. The prior art of record does not teach or reasonably suggest a composition for controlling or eliminating the recited insect populations comprising an insecticidal effective amount of *Rhodobacter capsulatus* bacteria and an insect food, whereby the insect food comprises at least 60 wt.% carbohydrate (as well as having/providing the other recited limitations) instantly claimed in claims 40, 49, and 60-68.

Art Unit: 1654

Accordingly, appropriately incorporating the limitations of claims 39 and 40 into independent claim 35, and the limitations of claims 48 and 49 into independent claim 42, would overcome the art rejections above (please note that if the Biological Deposit requirement, as set forth above, has not yet been met at the time of response to this Office action, a Notice of Allowance would still be mailed to the Applicants - provided the claims are appropriately amended - with a notation thereon stating that the Biological Deposit must be submitted : see item 7 of the Notice of Allowability form PTO-37).

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1654

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Tate whose telephone number is (571) 272-0970. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campbell can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Christopher R. Tate
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1654